

W-01906A-09-0283

ORIGINAL



0000097832

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMIS

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Carmen Madrid**Phone:** ()**Fax:** ()**Priority:** Respond Within Five Days**Opinion** **No.** 2009 **81155****Date:** 8/13/2009**Complaint Description:** 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed
N/A Not Applicable**First:****Last:****Complaint By:** Kent

Hubbard

Account Name: Kent Hubbard**Street:****City:**

Sierra Vista

State:

AZ

Zip: ()**Home:** (000) 000-0000**Work:** (000) 000-0000**CBR:****is:****Utility Company:** East Slope Water Company**Division:** Water**Contact Name:** ()**Contact Phone:** ()**Nature of Complaint:**

Regarding the matter of East Slope Water Company's proposed surcharge to be heard on August 18, 2009, Docket No. W-1906A-09-0283, in Tucson.

Ladies & Gentlemen:

When I first received notice of the East Slope Water Company's (hereafter referred to as (Company)) I was dismayed and determined to fight it with all my resources. My plans for drip irrigation and use of water might be sorely disrupted. I saw it as an attempt of foreign managers to gain unfair and unnecessary money to upgrade an antiquated water system for their own profit. I have since been enlightened by folks close to the situation; with that said allow me to share my earlier thoughts about the proposed rate increase as follows

(1) **SURCHARGE:** defined as an overcharge, a fee, an impost, a surcharge is simply more money for the same service or product. A surcharge doesn't give the customer rights, or a share in future profits. I argue against this surcharge because it lacks a time limit. It is common knowledge that taxes, fees and surcharges once approved are rarely terminated. I would accept a proposal that uses the words Temporary Surcharge depending on other conditions.

(2) **EMERGENCY:** an unforeseen circumstance or event that calls for immediate action. The Company has used an alarming word to describe repairs and upgrades that can and should be achieved by judicious management, planning and earmarked monies for routine maintenance. I submit that it is improper and unacceptable to surcharge the customers for the past failures of the operators of the Company.

(3) **FAIRNESS:** Customers of many years have enjoyed and received water at a bargain rate. What about fairness to recent customers? What about water conservationists versus abundant water users? I argue that those living on fixed incomes go to great pains to conserve water; others ignore the constraints of desert living. I suggest that modest users should be rewarded and the wasteful use of precious water should be punished. A fiat across-the-board surcharge creates an intolerable situation for all parties.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

(4) SOLUTION: Some have expressed the opinion that, "One asks the Commission for more than is required; they generally decide for a lower amount". Well isn't that a helter-skelter way of settling a difficult matter. The choice is clear. This writer submits that the Commission must deny the original request in its present form and direct the operators of the Company to present a proposal that includes (a) itemized upgrades, (b) estimates, (c) schedules, (d) alternative financing and (e) pro-rated charges based on water usage and seniority with the Company

Thank you for your time and careful analysis in this situation.

Respectfully submitted,

Kent Hubbard
[REDACTED]

Sierra Vista, AZ [REDACTED]

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

8/13/09 Opinion filed in Docket No. W-01906A-09-0283 closed

End of Comments

Date Completed: 8/13/2009

Opinion No. 2009 - 81155
